

1  
2  
3 FRANK S. WALKER,  
4 Plaintiff,  
5 v.  
6 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
7 SECURITY,  
8 Defendant.

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
5 SAN JOSE DIVISION

6  
7 Case No. [13-cv-05037-BLF](#)  
8  
9  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**ORDER SETTING BRIEFING  
SCHEDULE RE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR INJUNCTION AGAINST  
GARNISHMENT; VACATING AUGUST  
21, 2014 HEARING**

[Re: ECF 43, 46, 48, 49, 51]

This is a Social Security appeal pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). Before the Court are *pro se* plaintiff Frank S. Walker's numerous serial motions filed on June 20, (ECF 43), July 14, (ECF 46), July 28, (ECF 48), August 11, 2014 (ECF 49), and August 13, 2014 (ECF 51). These motions were filed after the conclusion of briefing on the parties' cross motions for summary judgment concerning the main appeal, as ordered by this Court on April 30, 2014. (Order, ECF 34)

As a preliminary matter, Plaintiff's several motions purport to notice a hearing on August 21, 2014 before this Court. This hearing was not noticed in compliance with the Court's standing order and does not appear on the Court's calendar. To eliminate any confusion, however, the Court hereby **VACATES the August 21, 2014 hearing** set by Plaintiff.

Plaintiff's filings are confusing and incomprehensible, and the gravamen of each is not clear. Construing the filings liberally, all of Plaintiff's submissions appear concerned with the Social Security Administration's levies on Plaintiff's federal income tax returns and back wages to collect on the Social Security overpayments that are the subject of the appeal before this Court. (*See, e.g.*, June 20 Mot. ¶¶ 5-20, 127; July 14 Mot. ¶ 136; July 28 Mot. ¶¶ 6-43, 104, 117-19) Plaintiff's calculation of the amount garnished varies in each filing, but it appears that about \$4,685 has been garnished. Plaintiff appears to be requesting that the administrative record reflect

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 this garnishment, that the Court order the Administration to return what was previously garnished,  
2 and that the Court enjoin the Administration from making any further garnishments during the  
3 pendency of this appeal. (*See* June 20 Mot. ¶ 127; July Mot. ¶ 136; July 28 Mot. ¶ 117-19)

4 Plaintiff has not identified any authority in support of these extraordinary requests.  
5 Nonetheless, in view of Plaintiff's *pro se* status, the Court finds it prudent to order a response from  
6 the Administration.<sup>1</sup> IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 7 1. The Administration shall file a brief not exceeding 10 double-spaced pages  
8 addressing: (1) the nature and amount of the garnishment of Plaintiff's federal  
9 income tax and back wages; (2) the authority pursuant to which the Administration  
10 is making these garnishments; and (3) why this Court should not enjoin the  
11 Administration against making further garnishments during the pendency of this  
12 appeal. The Administration shall file this brief by **August 29, 2014**.
- 13 2. Plaintiff may file a reply to the Administration's brief not exceeding 7 double-  
14 spaced pages. Such reply shall be filed no later than **September 12, 2014**.
- 15 3. The matter will be submitted on the papers, and no hearing will be held.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: August 15, 2014



19  
20 BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> The Court is in receipt of the Administration's single-page response filed August 15, 2014.  
(ECF 53) As the response does not address all of the issues identified in this order, the Court finds  
that further briefing is necessary.